

**REDACTED VERSION  
PURSUANT TO 35-A M.R.S.A. § 704(5)**

STATE OF MAINE  
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Docket No. 2004-575

September 20, 2004

**[Customers]**

ORDER

Appeal of Consumer Assistance  
Division Decision #2004-17904 Regarding  
Verizon Maine

---

WELCH, Chairman; DIAMOND and REISHUS, Commissioners

---

**I. SUMMARY**

We uphold our Consumer Assistance Division's (CAD) August 16, 2004 decision requiring Verizon customer **[Customer]** to pay Verizon for the toll charges associated with in-state long distance calls between Orland, Maine and Augusta, Maine.

**II. BACKGROUND**

On July 23, 2004, **[Customer]** contacted CAD concerning his July 2004 bill with Verizon. **[Customer]** owed \$1,402.10.<sup>1</sup> **[Customer]** was having trouble connecting to the Internet and allowed his Internet provider, AOL, to reconfigure his connection. This resulted in his Internet calls being directed to Augusta, a long-distance call from his home in Orland, Maine.

CAD issued its decision on August 16, 2004. It found that Verizon had correctly billed **[Customer]** at 10¢ per minute, the rate under the Sensible Minute Plan to which he subscribes.

**[Customer]** appealed the decision on August 23, 2004. He states that he had originally chosen three local numbers for connection to AOL, but when he had problems and he allowed AOL to correct it, he was switched to a long distance number. He claims that he cannot afford to pay the bill.

**III. DECISION**

Although we are sympathetic with **[Customer's]** situation, his complaint is with AOL, not Verizon. Given that he made long-distance calls, we have no authority to relieve him from paying for those calls. He may wish to contact AOL to see if it can

---

<sup>1</sup> **[Customer's]** bill for the period of June 16 through July 15, 2004 showed in-state long distance calls totaling 20,972 minutes at a charge of \$2,097. Due to a problem unrelated to this complaint, some Verizon customer bills showed double billings for toll calls for calls made between June 20 and July 5, 2004. Verizon has subsequently credited customers for this error on customer's August bill. Therefore the amount in dispute for **[Customer]** is \$1,402.10 (rather than \$2,097.20).

**REDACTED VERSION**  
**PURSUANT TO 35-A M.R.S.A. § 704(5)**

**Order**

**2**

**Docket No. 2004-575**

provide any assistance. **[Customer]** has a right to a payment arrangement. If he cannot pay the bill all at once, he should contact Verizon to make such an arrangement. Therefore, we uphold CAD's decision of August 16, 2004.

Dated at Augusta, Maine, this 20<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2004.

BY ORDER OF THE COMMISSION

---

Dennis L. Keschl  
Administrative Director

COMMISSIONERS VOTING FOR:      Welch  
   Diamond  
   Reishus

**REDACTED VERSION**  
**PURSUANT TO 35-A M.R.S.A. § 704(5)**

**Order**

**3**

**Docket No. 2004-575**

**NOTICE OF RIGHTS TO REVIEW OR APPEAL**

5 M.R.S.A. § 9061 requires the Public Utilities Commission to give each party to an adjudicatory proceeding written notice of the party's rights to review or appeal of its decision made at the conclusion of the adjudicatory proceeding. The methods of review or appeal of PUC decisions at the conclusion of an adjudicatory proceeding are as follows:

1. Reconsideration of the Commission's Order may be requested under Section 1004 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (65-407 C.M.R.110) within 20 days of the date of the Order by filing a petition with the Commission stating the grounds upon which reconsideration is sought.
2. Appeal of a final decision of the Commission may be taken to the Law Court by filing, within **21 days** of the date of the Order, a Notice of Appeal with the Administrative Director of the Commission, pursuant to 35-A M.R.S.A. § 1320(1)-(4) and the Maine Rules of Appellate Procedure.
3. Additional court review of constitutional issues or issues involving the justness or reasonableness of rates may be had by the filing of an appeal with the Law Court, pursuant to 35-A M.R.S.A. § 1320(5).

Note: The attachment of this Notice to a document does not indicate the Commission's view that the particular document may be subject to review or appeal. Similarly, the failure of the Commission to attach a copy of this Notice to a document does not indicate the Commission's view that the document is not subject to review or appeal.